

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 380

SP 003 580

AUTHOR Wilhelms, Fred T.
TITLE Realignments for Teacher Education. 11th Charles W.
 Hunt Lecture.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher
 Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation, Field Experience
 Programs, General Education, Liberal Arts, *Teacher
 Education

ABSTRACT

Two of teacher education's most acute problems seem largely beyond its control. The biggest lies in the so-called liberal arts sector, in the preparation the prospective teacher gets in his own teaching fields and in general education. Professional education and the subject matter preparation of a teacher simply cannot be acceptably done in near total isolation from one another. If we cannot persuade the arts faculty to contribute proportionately to the candidate's fitness to be a teacher, we may have to move for control of the background preparation of teachers. The second major problem is in the use of public schools, chiefly for student teaching, but more generally for experience and contact with reality. We need a new partnership which provides a genuine problem-solving, self-exploratory approach in place of mere "practice." One aspect of the needed program is a curriculum of field experiences starting at the very beginning of the professional sequence and proceeding with it simultaneously. Two other suggested program elements are (1) a continuing seminar, running the whole length of the professional period, led by a team representing such components as psychology, the social foundations, philosophy, and curriculum, and constituting the major guiding influence in the student's personal/professional development, and (2) an instructional laboratory, richly equipped and manned by a variety of specialists, a skills center to build specific proficiencies. (JS)

The First Ten Lectures

**1960—The Dimensions of Professional
Leadership**

Laurence DeFee Haskew

1961—Revolution in Instruction

Lindley P. Stiles

**1962—Imperatives for Excellence in
Teacher Education**

J. W. Maucker

**1963—Africa, Teacher Education, and the
United States**

Karl W. Bigelow

**1964—The Certification of Teachers:
The Restricted State Approved
Program Approach**

James B. Conant

**1965—Perspective on Action in
Teacher Education**

Florence B. Stratemeyer

**1966—Leadership for Intellectual
Freedom in Higher Education**

Willard B. Spalding

**1967—Tradition and Innovation in
Teacher Education**

Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J.

1968—Teachers: The Need and the Task

Felix C. Robb

**1969—A Consumer's Hopes and Dreams
for Teacher Education**

Elizabeth D. Koentz

11th
Charles W. Hunt
Lecture

Realignments
for Teacher
Education

February 25, 1970
The Conrad Hilton
Chicago
The American
Association of
Colleges for
Teacher Education

ED037380

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

SP003580

The Lecture Series

The CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURES, given over a period of eleven years at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, commencing in 1960, were established by action of the Executive Committee of the Association. The Lecture Series was conceived as a professional tribute to the long years of leadership and service which Dr. Hunt has given to teacher education as a teacher, a university dean, a college president, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and a consultant to the Executive Committee of AACTE.

Charles W. Hunt has combined vision with practicality in encouraging voluntary cooperation among higher education institutions for the improvement of teacher education. The AACTE is proud to acknowledge its great respect and appreciation for Dr. Hunt's educational statesmanship, his devotion to teacher education, his insights into human behavior, and his personal friendship.

A Life Devoted to Education

CHARLES WESLEY HUNT, born in Charlestown, New Hampshire, October 20, 1880, educated at Brown University (A.B. 1904), Columbia University (A.M. 1910, Ph.D. 1922); teacher of English, Vermont Academy, Saxtons River, 1904-06; Moses Brown School, Providence, Rhode Island, 1906-08; teacher, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908-09; supervising principal, Union School, Briar Cliff Manor, New York, 1910-13; supervisor, Children's Aid Society Schools, New York City, 1913-14; assistant secretary, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1914-16; vice-principal, Horace Mann School, New York City, 1918-21; director of extramural instruction, University of Pittsburgh, 1921-24; acting dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1923-24; dean, Cleveland School of Education, 1924-28; professor of education and dean, School of Education, Western Reserve University, 1928-33; principal, New York State Normal School, Oneonta, New York, 1933-42; president, New York State Teachers College, Oneonta, New York, 1942-51; secretary-treasurer, American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1928-48; secretary-treasurer, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948-53; and consultant to AACTE Executive Committee since 1953.

A deep and long-standing interest in curriculum development is at the core of Fred T. Wilhelms' professional life. And his background has been one which has prepared him for that interest and his current role as executive secretary of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

A native of Nebraska, Dr. Wilhelms received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Nebraska. He taught and served in an administrative capacity in Nebraska schools for seven years, then became active in Nebraska University's Extension Division, where he led in the development of supervised correspondence study as a way of enriching the inadequate programs of smaller schools. From Nebraska, he went on to a one-year stint with the U.S. Department of Justice—developing a program for the education of aliens for citizenship. He then joined the National Association of Secondary School Principals as associate director of the Consumer Education Study. His next post was as professor of education in curriculum and supervision at San Francisco State College. He was appointed chairman of the Division of Education and Psychology there, a position he held for eight years. Following that, he headed a five-year experimental study of teacher education, under the aegis of the National Institution of Mental Health.

Dr. Wilhelms returned to the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1963, this time as associate secretary. He studied questions on curricula and supervisory leadership and acted as a guide to administrators in these areas. In addition he wrote the Association's *Spotlight*, as well as an occasional *Curriculum Report* and issue of the *Bulletin*.

His years with the ASCD have been active ones. In 1946 he was co-chairman of the Association's Yearbook Committee, and its chairman in 1967. He served on the Board of Directors and was chairman of the Publications Committee. He has been ASCD executive secretary since 1968.



Copyright © 1970 by
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036
SBN: 910052-46-8

REALIGNMENTS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Fred T. Wilhelms

The Eleventh Charles W. Hunt Lecture

Presented at the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Chicago, Illinois
February 25, 1970

Contrary to the speaker's usual opening sentence, I am rather *unhappy* to be standing before you today. It is going on seven years since I have been actively engaged in the education of teachers. It is nearly a dozen years since I had administrative responsibility for a large and completely comprehensive program of teacher education. That is time enough to get pretty rusty in any scholarly field, and particularly one which has been changing in many ways. In the intervening years, to be sure, my interests have remained keen, and I have kept a weather eye on what has been going forward. Nevertheless, I want to stipulate immediately that you are more expert and knowledgeable than I am and that I owe you the respect and modesty an outsider always ought to feel in the presence of those who are doing the work.

But I have also had time enough to repent of the sins I committed in the names of bureaucracy and academic respectability. Freed from the daily exigencies of the job and the constant necessity of compromise, one can pause to look the fundamentals in the eye and to work through to a new perspective. Along with this comes a wonderful upsurge—the nerve to bell a few cats that one knew, all along, needed to be belled.

I have decided, therefore, not to try to "scholar up" this paper with references to all the most recent developments, which, in my position, I should have had to dig out with great labor. Rather, I want to make this a deeply personal and bold statement of the way I now see things. I realize this is presumptuous, and I confess it takes all the nerve I have, but I suspect it may be the greatest service I can offer. Let me say also that I intend to talk about teacher education as it actually is, about the great bulk of its programs as they actually are. I admire the new models being developed, and I think teacher education

people have some very attractive ideas floating around. But the realities are still the realities.

One of the worst problems of teacher education is that two of its most acute problems are largely beyond its control. I know most people assume that, in the education of teachers, the salient problems will always be found in the professional sector. But I believe the biggest single problem lies in the so-called liberal arts sector, in the preparation the prospective teacher gets in his own teaching fields and in general education.

I became sensitized to this while I was working in California, where our secondary candidates went through a required five-year program. Now, the mathematics of a five-year program, as compared to a four-year one, are interesting. If you do not increase the time devoted to general education or to professional education, then the size of the students' majors and minors will almost double. I recall that one year, by actual count, the holdings of our secondary candidates averaged 48 semester units in their majors and 32 in their minors. Since the schools we served were mostly large urban ones whose teachers could specialize rather highly, we commonly had majors and minors closely related, as in a combination of the physical and biological sciences. This meant that the actual preparation of the students in one broad teaching field averaged 80 semester units.

That is a lot of preparation in one field. I was shocked, then, to find our students no more facile in teaching their subjects than those I had known with 27 or 30 units in the field. Inevitably, they *knew* the subject better, and they were pretty competent with it, as long as it remained in the same structure and sequence to which they had been accustomed. But they could not "play" with it comfortably or cleverly. They could not shift easily into a non-chronological treatment, nor move from a logical into a psychological mode. They saw the subject matter in linear fashion and could not accommodate a non-linear plunge into the middle. They knew quite a bit about their field, but they did not know what the field itself was all about. In Bruner's terms, they did not know the structure of their discipline. In philosophical terms, they had little feeling for fundamental purposes. They did not know how to *use* the content of the field for purposes beyond the content. They saw it only as a set body of knowledge and skill to be—in that horrible phrase—"put across."

To be blunt about it, they had been badly taught. Even now, it takes all the nerve I have to say this publicly. Our liberal arts brethren got the jump on us in the fifties and convicted us of anti-intellectualism, low academic standards, and all that. They almost convinced us ourselves of our inferiority. And it is still hard to turn the accusation in their direction. But the cold fact is that their curricula are not only largely irrelevant, but almost deliberately so. They teach a million bits and pieces and rarely offer even a glimpse of a coherent whole. They almost deliberately turn their backs on relevant life purposes, preferring the technical rigors of the "pure" and remote discipline. When I spoke earlier of the liberal arts, I used the expression "so-called" because the old liberal fields—even the humanities—have increasingly become as technical as a course in sheet-metal working. I am not at all sure they do not deserve the term *illiberal* arts. And, all too typically, the treatment of students puts the freeze on individuality and autonomy, not to mention free inquiry and creativity.

This is no way to produce the bold, philosophical, autonomous young professional we need. It may—though I doubt it—be a good way to produce research-oriented Ph.D.'s. But it is no way to produce young teachers who see their subject matter whole, in a context of personal and social purposes, and who are able to use it for the growth of children and youth and the betterment of a society sorely tried.

The situation is fundamentally serious. It forces us forever to start from behind, to try in one or two methods courses to make up for deficits accumulated over several years. In earlier days I used to be grateful that teacher education had abandoned the old normal school model where every background course became a sort of junior-grade methods course. I guess I still am. Certainly, I still believe that our teachers must be prepared by first-rate scholars operating in the challenging environment of the multipurpose facility. But can we not find some middle ground? Professional education and the subject matter preparation of a teacher simply cannot be acceptably done in near total isolation from one another. We need people prepared in a special way just because they are going to be teachers. I know—given the typical college or university structure and, even more, its mind set—that any such recon-

struction will be an awesome task. But I think it is time to come out flatly for what our job requires.

The arts faculties control some eighty percent of the prospective teacher's collegiate time. We have a right to demand, then, that they contribute proportionately to his fitness to be a teacher. They are not now doing so. I hope we can work this through with them so that they will put new effort into reshaping both their offerings and the climate in which the work is done. But I am not optimistic. My own experience is that they are delighted to criticize the professional sector, but mostly unwilling—perhaps unable—to look at their own sector with philosophical and critical eyes. We may be forced to move for control of the background preparation of teachers. I know that attempt would add, shall we say, *flavor* to our lives on campus! But, in all soberness, it may be our duty to the schools.

That, in my judgment, is one realignment in teacher education that we have to have.

The second major problem, which lies a bit outside our direct control, is also painful to probe because it involves criticism of a well-meaning and often generous partner. I refer to our use of the public schools, chiefly for student teaching, but more generally for experience and contact with reality. Obviously, this resource is essential to us; without it our programs would be almost completely verbal and out of touch with reality. Such devices as microteaching and the use of the newer media may free us a little, or at least modify our use of the experiential side. But real experience is still essential.

Why do I raise the question at all then? Because I see our typical use of the schools as a condemnation to mediocrity—or worse. I know that I fly in the face of much opinion here. I know that there are many, from Conant on down, who feel that the best way to train a teacher is to put him with an older teacher who will show him how. Whenever I hear this view expressed—no matter how nicely the view is cloaked in words like “internship” or “clinical professor”—I want to yell, “You have to be kidding!” Are we talking about training for a mechanical trade or educating for an intellectual profession?

We all know what really happens. In the first place—and this is our own fault—the student teaching in which we still place our major experi-

ential investment, is generally done too late. With a growing number of exceptions, it comes *after* the study of psychology, sociology, educational principles, and even methods, and therefore cannot motivate or inform any of them. To compensate for this, many colleges strive for some pattern of observation and mild participation. *But the student teaching is still the real thing.* And that is a great part of what is the matter with it. The emotional pressure is too high. The situation is too tight. With so much at hazard—his whole career, as many a student teacher sees it—who can be psychologically free to look at himself with clear eyes, to take in without distortion the stimuli that arise out of this supreme learning experience, to play around speculatively with creative ideas? Only someone very bold and self-assured can assert his real self.

And there is solid reason behind the resulting tightness and self-restraint. The basic fact of a student teacher's life is that he is captive. The typical cooperating teacher subscribes implicitly to the trade school ethic. Student teaching, in his view, is not for exploration; it is for practice, for the perfecting of skills. The conscientious older teacher works hard to show the neophyte how to teach. (And, in all justice, he gives much practical help.) But the lid is on; or, even if it really is not, the student thinks it is, and that amounts to the same thing. The anxious youngster sweats to do everything as he thinks his mentor wants it done. And when, on occasion, his college supervisor drops around, he really sweats to resolve the conflicting images he senses his two superiors have in mind. And so, in what ought to be the greatest learning experience in the young professional's life, what is really happening is the start of an unrelenting indoctrination into the very system we are all trying to break out of. When the young professional ought to be finding his own unique self, he is instead warped by someone else's style and being.

There is another way of looking, not only at the student teaching but also at the whole professional sequence. That is to ask ourselves how much developmental guidance it delivers. A young person entering his preparation for a profession has a right to expect that it will help him, step by step, not merely in acquiring the necessary skills and knowledge, but, more fundamentally, in *becoming a professional person.* After all, the

time of professional preparation is much like a "second adolescence." It is accompanied by comparable doubts, uncertainties, and fears of inadequacy. The initial commitment to being a teacher is generally weak and shallow. It is more like choosing a job than committing oneself meaningfully to a way of life and a rich purpose. Perhaps above all else, the period of preparation ought to be a time of maturation into a young professional.

And how does our traditional program stack up against that need? Let's look at that in terms of a rather successful student coming to us with, say, a "B" average. The courses he is likely to take—psychology, social foundations, etc.—are about as academic as the courses he has come out of. He will probably earn a "B" average in them, too. What has he learned about himself, then, as a professional teacher? Before he comes to student teaching, what "feel" has he got of what it means to be a teacher? What does he know about his own strengths in communicating with and relating to children or adolescents? What insights has he gained as to how it feels to step in and take charge, to be the responsible adult? In cold fact he might almost as well be seen as just a college student who happens to be taking some education courses. The program has added virtually nothing to his perception of himself as an autonomous professional, nor his knowledge of the strengths he has and the changes he needs to work toward.

Furthermore, there is a question as to how much encouragement, or even freedom, the student is given during this period to explore himself as an autonomous professional. About a decade ago at San Francisco State College, I did a study of the perceptions of our education students with regard to our professional program. It was a time of intense criticism of teacher education, and our students might well have been expected to echo the popular charges of endless repetition, low intellectual quality, and all that. They did not do so, very much. But we *did* have, I believe, an exceptionally free-swinging, permissive faculty. Yet I found large numbers of our students convinced of one damning thing: *They were not free.* Many, even of the friendliest respondents, believed that the faculty had a "party line" of beliefs and they felt obliged to pretend to believe

in those doctrines. What bothered me most was that they seemed to accept this as inevitable.

I do not believe that the situation at my old college, with its long, liberal tradition, was worse than the norm. To be honest, I believe it was distinctly better than average. If that is true, what do we have in our professional programs? A student who is not only captive during his student teaching, but also psychologically cornered in the courses that precede student teaching. I don't want to put that too strongly. I don't mean that we abuse our students. I mean only that we provide the wrong kind of climate for what we want to grow—or ought to want to grow.

I opened this section with a few rather embarrassed remarks about our traditional alignment with the public schools as our experimental laboratory. I am now ready to argue that our use of that laboratory must be radically reshaped. I am going to argue this on two grounds:

1. Any professional program which depends on a sequence leading from abstract, theoretical, academic study of education to a final massive dose of experience is unsound and likely to be ineffective.
2. Any professional program which finally delivers the student into the hands of one or two "master teachers" who are to show him how to teach is not only unsound but also potentially damaging—and this is true even if the master teachers are exceptionally skilled.

The first of my arguments is commonplace. Anybody with common sense knows that the traditional theory-first-practice-last sequence is ineffective because it wastes the opportunity to use real experience as a motivating force for deepened study, because it brings the student into such study with inadequate apperceptive background, and because much of the understanding and skill presumed to have been generated in the earlier courses has somehow vanished before it can be applied. It never was truly learned, or it was learned in forms that prevent the student from recognizing "on the hoof" the very problems he studied *via* the textbook. One could easily expand that line of argument, but any experienced teacher-educator can embroider it for himself.

My primary objections lie along another line. I object to such a program because it offers too little opportunity for self-exploration and mat-

uration as a professional person. This is also the basis for my second point: that putting a student teacher in the hands of one of two master teachers courts disaster. I want to make it perfectly clear that this is not because I consider those teachers "bad." It is simply that no aspiring young professional should be forced into a situation where he is warped to fit somebody else's preconceptions.

We need a continuing situation which is extremely "open." To me this means, first of all, that the program of experiential learnings should begin just as early as the program of intellectual analysis, and should proceed alongside it, step by step. At every step the two should be interwoven. Every bit of experience should feed naturally into the next step of intellectualization and every intellectual increment should enrich the next bit of experience. As to the experiences themselves, one can lay down a number of criteria:

1. Experience should have an exploratory quality, moving around in the whole school situation and out into the community.
2. The experience should also have an inward quality, at each step helping the young person see himself more clearly *as a teacher*. In this it must be aided in the intellectual sector by teaching which has much of the quality of counseling.
3. If experience is to have this self-revealing quality, the emotional loading at each step must be appropriately light. Any psychologist knows that human beings look at themselves with clear eyes only if they can afford to. When the stresses grow too great—as they often do in student teaching—people close down their perceptions, distort the stimuli, and see what they need to see.
4. To achieve appropriate emotional lightness, it is probably best, for quite a while, to stick to the tasks of getting acquainted and learning to relate easily with children and youth—and colleagues—in relatively informal situations. The formal and much heavier role of *director of learning* had better be held till late in the game.
5. At least until very late in the sequence, experiences should be selected and evaluated primarily for other than practice or skill-

building effects. The proper role of early experience is to help the student see reality, to find out what the problems are, to open his eyes to possibilities, and to get him comfortable with kids and schools. Even more fundamentally, the job is to help the learner know his own peculiar strengths, grow confident in using them, find out what kind of teacher he wants to be in what kinds of settings, and slowly form his own personal commitments. How well the student performs in each situation is not the point. He needs room to grope and blunder, and not at the price of being forever picked at. And the question of "timing" such experience is a very nice one.

6. A broad, varied pattern of experiences should bring the student into contact with many and varied potential models. He should not be stuck with any one situation or cooperating teacher after it becomes unprofitable to him. It does not even matter if some of the models are not so good. With open eyes, he can pick and choose what fits *him*, finally matching no one model *in toto*. He needs desperately to learn that he, the unique person, has his own peculiar mix of strengths and qualities, that he does not need to be like any other teacher. What he needs to be is a whole person.

7. Experience ought to assume an important role as problem-solver. I am not talking about a system in which the student gets the word on campus and then goes out to apply it. School and campus are both sources of insight, complementing each other.

Now I recognize that an experiential program thus conceived will call for a pretty different partnership. It will have to be a bit loose, jointly planned, and dependent on a great deal of mutual forbearance. In a way, it will demand more of the schools, but at the same time it will deliver them an increasing resource of youthful help. Anyway, I know that public school people believe so strongly in the experiential component of professional education that they will willingly sweat out quite a bit of bother.

What will likely be hardest to get across, to ourselves as well as to our partners, is a conception of experience which does not equate it with practice and does not immediately make skill in per-

formance the criterion. Cooperating teachers and principals like the nice, orderly routines of a student teacher in a set place at a set hour for a set number of weeks. But a genuinely exploratory feeling-out of the experiences a given student needs will not be all that orderly.

The second great realignment we need, then, is a partnership with the schools which provides a genuine problem-solving, self-exploratory approach in place of mere "practice." It will be hard to achieve. But it is essential.

And here, once more, I need to shift gears. From the very beginning, organized programs of teacher preparation have been centered upon skills. Even today, if an experienced teacher goes to summer school, in common parlance he is going to learn the "new methods." There has been an unspoken assumption that in heaven there is laid up for us a perfect *body of practices* and that any teacher who learns and practices them will automatically become a good teacher.

Well, what are those practices? For a half century we have been trying to find ways of evaluating the effectiveness of teachers and teaching. We have failed, dismally. *Why?* If the key to good teaching were some set body of practices, surely we could long since have measured whether the right "methods" were being used. But the hard data always confound us. Always there is the teacher who "does all the wrong things"—and succeeds. And always, down the hall, there is the sweet thing who "does everything right" and can't teach a lick.

I do not claim that there are not, in a general way, better and worse ways of teaching. I even recognize that recently we are coming closer to identifying some components of superior teaching (such as asking better questions). I do not wish to oppose the development of skills. I believe that using such devices as videotaping segments of teaching and subjecting the tapes to analysis, perhaps some form of interaction analysis, are proving enormously important.

And yet, over the years, I have slowly been driven back to an overwhelming faith in the *primacy of the person*. It is the person inside the teacher that counts. What he is. What she is. There are other elements of importance, but this is it. With Arthur Combs, I believe that the effective teacher is the mature person who has learned to use himself effectively as a teaching instru-

ment. Teaching is a personal act. It is basically intercommunicative and interrelative with other persons. In that constant interrelation the true personality can, by design, be covered up for a while. But not for long, not in the thousand and one impulsive decisions of the working day. In the final analysis, what the teacher is, is more important than anything he does.

And where does that leave us, in teacher education? Helpless? Thrown back on the cliché that good teachers are born, not made? Not at all! It only means that we must go at the business of educating teachers in a fundamentally different way.

I hope you have noticed that I have been trying to get at this all along. When I spoke of possibly needing to take over the academic preparation of teachers, I was thinking only in part of their subject matter proficiency. The freshman year of college is none too early to start a program which progressively enriches a student's self-concept and takes him on the road to everything that professionalism means. If we want a free-swinging, autonomous, sensitive student at graduation, we cannot afford years of subservient detention in a home for dependents.

When I spoke of the problems we face in our partnership with the public schools, I was not primarily worried about what happens to competences. I was worried about a student who was cabined, cribbed, and confined under a dictatorship of accomplished skill, and I was wondering how, next year, he was supposed to accept the mantle of independence.

Now it is time to look at what we ourselves can do, in our own limited life space. It is not so little, if we can reconceptualize our purposes. Our primary purpose must be to *help each candidate as much as we can in his personal/professional becoming*. Fortunately, quite a bit of the subject matter we want to use anyway, for technical purposes, will lend itself naturally to this personal use. We shall not have to sacrifice proficiency in order to gain maturation.

I have already sketched one aspect of the program we need: a curriculum of field experiences starting at the very beginning of the professional sequence and proceeding with it *pari passu*. This curriculum will consist of many pieces, highly individualized, to meet each student's needs, largely self-selected by the student under guidance and

aimed more at self-development than at skill development.

Now, back on the campus, what curriculum shall we lay alongside that field curriculum and interweave with it? I suggest, first of all, that we jettison the stereotyped sequence of academic courses in education. They are too narrow and piecemeal, and too confusing. We need, I believe, just two program elements:

1. A continuing seminar, running the whole length of the professional period. It should be led by a team representing such components as psychology, the social foundations, philosophy, and curriculum. For the sake of maximum openness and sensitivity, it will be best if the same students and the same faculty team can continue together over a long time. And it will be desirable to have the faculty team work with the students in the field as well as on campus, so that all have a common background. This seminar will constitute the major guiding influence in the student's entire development.

2. An instructional laboratory, richly equipped and manned by a variety of specialists, to be used by each student when he needs it and in his own way. It might well be called a skills center, for its purpose is to build specific proficiencies. The faculty in charge will not have primary responsibility for the more personal guidance of a student's development. I am thinking here of the learning of specific methodologies, of the appropriate use of educational technology, perhaps the mastery of one or more forms of interaction analysis, probably the utilization of microteaching and guided analysis of the resulting videotapes.

There are many persons in this audience who have been in on the development of such laboratories and who are far more sophisticated in using them than I shall ever be. Therefore, I shall not elaborate on the laboratories any further, except to insist that they deserve a truly massive investment and such staffing as will permit their flexible use by individuals as needed.

But the brief treatment I am giving the instructional laboratory should not be construed as lack of emphasis upon it. I believe we are getting to the point where we can take the act

of teaching apart and deliberately build skill into each of its component parts (as, for example, the art of asking good questions, or the deliberate teaching of the ability to abstract and to generalize). I believe that it will be in the laboratory that we can make use of programmed instruction, and all the other resources which technology newly offers us. It will be in the laboratory that we can get at the best that is coming out of the great curriculum projects. My reason for treating all this briefly is cast in Dr. Johnson's reply when the lady caught him out on his definition of the pastern: "Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance."

I should like, then, to turn back to the basic seminar, with which I feel more comfortable. It should be supremely "open" and supportive. It does not need—and should not have—any pre-committed scope and sequence of ground to be covered. With the free and varied program of field experiences as base, the students and faculty can analyze their needs and plan each next step with complete confidence that whatever is essential to professional education will claim its place naturally. Middle class students who have had close relations with slum children will want to know more about them. If they have had trouble with motivation and discipline, they will be eager consumers of psychology. If they have tried a little teaching, they will be almost too anxious to study better ways of teaching.

In this process it is inevitable that whatever is important from disciplines such as psychology and sociology will find plenty of room. But while such a seminar will teach the background knowledge a teacher needs—and teach it so that it will stick, because what is learned is learned in the heat of experience—the fundamental purposes of the seminar will be much more personal. For instance, such a seminar can and should use a wide variety of large-group and small-group processes so long and so sophisticatedly that the students will feel completely at home with them. These processes should be explicated and discussed occasionally. But they need not be taught as a separate set of "methods," because the young teachers will continue on with them as naturally as they breathe.

Beyond group process, the seminar can use itself as a laboratory for the understanding of group

dynamics—of the forces at work in any group. This will require planned effort, but with effort it will be simple enough.

Beyond even this, the seminar will be a natural setting for a long, gentle, nonintrusive development of sensitivity training. Brought along slowly over several semesters, in a warm, supportive *milieu*, it need have none of the abruptness and all-too-frequent cruelty of the hurry-up job. It should help each student enormously to find out who he really is, how people react to him and why, what his unique strengths are, and how to use them. And, in the main, this can be done while the primary focus is on professional problems, turning inward only as the students themselves willingly open up their personal sides. When, for an individual, more depth is needed, what arises in the seminar can be carried over into private counseling with a congenial member of the faculty team—or even with a counseling psychologist outside the team who is held ready for such occasions. I do not see the college as a psychiatric institution, but a wholesome educational situation is in itself therapeutic, and that therapeutic value can be multiplied by even *modest* efforts beyond the usual. The goal I am after here is to help each student toward that self-insight and self-acceptance which alone can lead to understanding and accepting others.

But I believe also that a powerful factor in a beginning teacher's mental health is the depth and richness of his commitments. Many of our young teachers are on shaky ground, psychologically, because they suspect they have chosen an unambitious career. Furthermore, they are not deaf to the rumors that what they are asked to learn in education courses is just a lot of words, unrelated to the real work of a teacher. When the rough realities of full-time teaching hit our graduate, it is not enough that somewhere along the line he has said, "I guess I'll be a teacher." He needs to know very firmly why he wants to be a teacher, what kind of teacher he means to be, and whom he wishes to teach, in what kind of situation. He needs commitments so rugged and so clearly understood that nothing can shake them.

The seminar I have sketched, combined with the ongoing curriculum of field experiences, provides just the right setting. The experiences will often be disturbing, frustrating, puzzling. There will be failures and there will be exhilarating suc-

cesses. There will be a growing fondness for the children and youths they "live" with, along with a growing recognition that a responsible adult cannot be just a fond buddy. Then the seminar, with its supportive, well-known faculty and its rich supply of friends in need, will be a home where everything can be admitted, boasted about, puzzled about, and where efforts can be replanned without fear of contempt or censure. Little by little, the joint combination of self-revealing experiences and group reflection will allow each young person to find himself and be himself, without the slightest need to fit himself to someone else's image.

I need not go further with this. Your imagination has undoubtedly leaped far ahead of me already. On the basis of my own experience I could easily show you that there will be no losses—there will be gains—in the students' growing understanding of what is important from psychology, curriculum theory, educational sociology, philosophy, and so on. Louis Alderman used to say that "adult education is like cooking for hungry people." Teaching psychology to students aroused by their experience with children and youth shares that quality.

But I have chosen to go straight down the line on the theme of helping each candidate in his personal/professional becoming. If it is the person inside the teacher that ultimately counts, then we must deliberately help that person grow as a professional. We need not fret eternally about every technical bit of knowledge. Hungry people search for what they need. In the instructional laboratory we can build the technical skills better than we ever have before. But let us keep the personal/professional emergence paramount.

In our work at San Francisco State College, my associates and I never quite accomplished all the serene splendors I have painted here. For one thing, the technology was not then anywhere near its present level. For another thing, both our wisdom and our nerve sometimes failed us. But we went far enough to know that what I have here envisioned was just at our fingertips. We were confident that, with a few more years of tryouts, we could have come fairly close to the mark.

And now, in closing, I should like to add a few editorial comments. We in teacher education have all too commonly been the stepchildren of the collegiate family. We have been put down, ridi-

culed, sniped at. We have had to do our work in a state of penury unimagined by educators for any other profession. We have had to carry student ratios that would stagger other professors. To cap it all, we have been uniquely self-analytical and evaluative and thus have borne heavy hearts for failures most faculties would not even notice, let alone admit.

Furthermore, in the past decade, the penury has been extended even to the time we have with our students. The great assault of the academicians, who liked to believe we didn't have anything to say anyway, has been dismayingly successful, and we are forced to operate in a pitifully pinched segment of time.

But we do have something to say, a very great deal to say, and it is fundamentally important. With each succeeding year, what we know about learning and teaching is growing. What we know about the school as a social institution, and about the needs of every subculture, is growing. We have something of great value to offer, and it is time to fight for the time and the resources to offer it.

In the great debates about education we are the ones who have been most nearly right all along. Not completely right, just nearly right. The public, aided and abetted by some of the prestigious academicians, have had their silly season of deriding the great progressive gains made from the twenties through the forties. They had their fun with the concept of the "whole child." They thought a school system that tried to wrestle with the real problems of life and of society was merely soft and anti-intellectual. They wanted schools to be rigorously intellectual, they said, concerned only with the pure disciplines. Their great emphasis was on the "precious few" who could meet their tunnel-vision notion of "excellence."

Well, they succeeded—for a while. Until the facts of life caught up with them. Then they had to rediscover the precious many, including the failures and the rebels and the dropouts, whom we had been fighting for all along. In considerable degree they achieved their planned irrelevance, with life deliberately shut out of the classroom. And what did it get them? A perceptive generation caught them in the act and went "alienated." They have rejected the concentration on the merely technical. The battle cry of "relevance" is heard from coast to coast, and the great humane values which have been our chief con-

cern are once more being forced upon those who sought to ignore them.

I don't suppose there is any use being vindictive about it all, though now and then I cannot resist a quiet "I told you so." We were not wholly perfect either. But there is a solid lesson here. Through all the confusion, we have consistently been the closest to wisdom. We have been the most perceptive and, as it turns out, the closest to the scientific truth. And we have been steadily dedicated to all the children of all the people and to the growth of the truly great society. A group with our record has no cause to hide its light or to retreat one inch.

The high principles of education for which we have stood are emerging once again, supported this time by increasing research, but tested also in the crucible of experience. It only remains now for us to apply them with unflinching honesty and idealism to our own great work: the preparation of a nation's teachers.